



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,614	02/27/2004	Qirfiraz Ahmed Siddiqui		6485
71192	7590	04/26/2010	EXAMINER	
QIRFIRAZ AHMED SIDDIQUI			KARIKARI, KWASI	
1752 KNOX STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CASTRO VALLEY, CA 94546			2617	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/26/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 11/788,614
Filing Date: February 27, 2004
Appellant(s): Siddiqui

Kamran Emdadi

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

I. This is in response to the appeal brief filed 02/10/2010 appealing from the Office action mailed 04/06/2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US. 6,879,838	Rankin et al	04/2005	
US. 6,946,991	Hasebe et al	09/2005	

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

II. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 12-26 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al., (U.S. 6,879,838 B2), (hereinafter Rankin) in view of Hasebe et al., (U.S. 6,946,991), (hereinafter Hasebe).

Regarding claim 12, Ranking discloses a method of notifying a mobile device (= mobile device 100) of location-dependent timings (= location base information system that uses user location information and preference to push location information to the user, see col. 6, lines 28-65 and Fig. 4) the method comprising:

 determining an estimated location of the mobile device, within a precision of a coverage area of at least one base station (= wireless base stations 140 in communication network 102, see col. 3, lines 36-42, 61-67 and Fig. 3) by employing a location technology algorithm (= once the mobile device 100 is determined to be within a defined area, the action may triggered, see col. 5, lines 27-40 and col. 6, lines 45-51; and the location determination system allows the device to determine its location either from the network or independently from the system, see col. 1, lines 54-64; col. 4, lines 12-16; and col. 7, line 55- col. 8, line 46);

 comparing the estimated location of the mobile device to a translation table stored at one or more memory locations including the mobile device and/or a remote server capable of forwarding information to the mobile device (= service/geographic location database could be copied into device 100, see col. 5, line 44- col.6, line 51), said translation table used to determine at least one time based on a function of at least the estimated location of the mobile device, the time of day as measured at the estimated location, and where the estimated location of the mobile device used to determine the at least one time is based on the coverage area of the at least one base station (140) and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter (=using time different arrival of a mobile signal at base station to triangulate position of device 100, see col. 4,

lines 12-34) assigned to the mobile device (see col. 3, lines 33-48, col. 4, line 12- col. 5, line 12, col. 5, lines 27-67; and col. 6, lines 28-51); wherein said Cell ID is a parameter in the translation table which identifies the Cell ID as an estimated location parameter of the mobile station based on the coverage area of the base station (=using time different arrival of a mobile signal at base station to triangulate position of device 100, see col. 4, lines 12-34); and

translating the determined at least one time into a wireless communication message and forwarding the message to the mobile device (see col. 4, line 38- col. 5, line 12 and col. 6, lines 28-51).

Although Rankin teaches the push of several event information to the mobile device based on location and time information and user's preference information (see col. 4, line 38- col. 5, line 12 and col. 6, lines 28-51), Rankin fails specifically to mention a prayer times; the time of year as measured from prestored annual calendar position corresponding to estimated location; and the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table".

Hasebe, however, teaches "prayer times; the time of year as measured from prestored annual calendar position corresponding to estimated location; and the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and

the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table”.

(see below of col. 1, lines 37-63; col. 3, lines 28-50; col. 9, line 10- col. 10, line 37; and col. 11, lines 20-32).

[Relationships between regional locations and religious service times are described in the form of religious service time tables, which are stored in advance in the memory of the portable terminal or which can be downloaded from a specific server via networks. Religious service times are determined based on the position information and date information (e.g., calendar data)...

In step S20, the portable telephone detects the date and year as well as the present position thereof. That is, the present position is detected based on the position information from the GPS receiver 12...

CPU 1 designates the religious service time table, which is stored in the RAM 3. Specifically, the religious service timetable contains numerous tables with regard to specific positions and dates, so that one of these tables is appropriately selected and read out in response to the position information from the GPS receiver 12 and the date information of the calendar data...]

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Regarding claim 13, as recited in claim 12, Rankin further discloses the method, wherein the estimated location of the mobile device has a precision of the coverage area of at least two adjacent base stations (see col. 3, lines 36-42 and lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 14, as cited in claim 12, Rankin teaches the pushing of preference information to the communication device 100 based on location/time in the network 102 that includes base stations 140 (see col. 3, lines 36-42, lines 49-60; col. 4, line 38- col. 5, line 12; col. 6, lines 28-51); and Fig. 2). However, Rankin fails to teach an “**Azaan-neighborhood**” in the translation table to determine the at least one “**prayer time**”.

However, Hasebe teaches a portable terminal that includes GPS; and the portable terminal associates location and time with prayer times and direction (see col. 1, lines 37-63; col. 3, lines 28-50 and col. 4, lines 6-45).

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Regarding claim 15, as recited in claim 12, Rankin fails specifically to teach the method, wherein the at least one prayer time is a Muslim prayer time.

Hasebe, however, teaches a portable terminal that includes GPS; and the portable terminal associates location and time with prayer times and direction. (see col. 1, lines 37-63; col. 3, lines 28-50 and col. 4, lines 6-45).

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Regarding claim 16, as recited in claim 12, Rankin further discloses the method, wherein the location technology algorithm calculates the location of the mobile device based on the Cell ID assigned to the mobile device (see col. 9, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 17, as recited in claim 12, Rankin further discloses the method, wherein the location technology algorithm calculates the location of the mobile device based one or more of the following location technologies: global positioning system (GPS), assisted global positioning system (AGPS), advanced forward link trilateration (AFLT), enhanced observed time difference (EOTD), lime difference of arrival (TDOA), angle of arrival (AOA) and enhanced forward link trilateration (EFLT) (= GPS system can involved in location determination function, see col. 4,lines 11-37).

Regarding claim 18, as recited in claim 12, Rankin further discloses the method, wherein the wireless communications operate over one or more of the following wireless

communications protocols: advanced mobile phone service (AMPS), global system for mobile communication (GSM), time division multiple access (TDMA), frequency division multiple access (FDMA), code division multiple access (CDMA), general packet radio service (GPRS), universal mobile telecommunications system (UMTS) and integrated digital enhanced network (/DEN') (= network 102 may be packet switch or circuit switch network, e.g. PSTN, see col. 6, lines 13-27).

Regarding claim 19, as recited and modified in claim 12, as Rankin further discloses the method, wherein the time is transmitted to the mobile device via a push protocol (see col. 4, line 61- col. 5, line 15)

Regarding claim 20, as recited in claim 12, Rankin further discloses the method, wherein the method further comprises: monitoring subscriber information of a plurality of subscribers stored in a database and determining if each subscriber is currently connected to the subscriber network and updating the current Cell ID and location information of the subscriber and determining at least one additional time based on the updated Cell ID and location information (see col. 4, lines 12-67).

Regarding claim 21, as recited in claim 12, Rankin further discloses the method, wherein the wireless communication message is at least one of a text message, a tone indicator and a media file (see col. 4, lines 6-11 and col. 6, lines 28-51).

Regarding claim 22, Rankin a method of notifying a mobile device (= mobile device 100) of location-dependent timings (= location base information system that uses user location information and preference to push location information to the user, see col. 6, lines 28-65 and Fig. 4), the method comprising:

determining an estimated location of the mobile device within a precision of a coverage area of at least one predetermined stored in a translation table stored at one or more memory locations including the mobile device and/or a remote server capable of forwarding information to the mobile device, said translation table used to map the coverage area to at least a portion of the coverage area of at least one base station in communication range of the mobile device (see col. 3, lines 33-67, col. 4, line 12- col. 5, line 12, col. 5, lines 27-67; and col. 6, lines 28-51);

determining at least one estimated time based on a function of at least the estimated location of the mobile device and the time of day as measured at the estimated location and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter (=using time different arrival of a mobile signal at base station to triangulate position of device 100, see col. 4, lines 12-34) assigned to the mobile device (see col. 3, lines 33-67, col. 4, line 12- col. 5, line 12, col. 5, lines 27-67; and col. 6, lines 28-51); wherein said Cell ID is a parameter in the translation table which identifies the Cell ID as an estimated location parameter of the mobile station based on the coverage area of the base station (=using time different arrival of a mobile signal at base station to triangulate position of device 100, see col. 4, lines 12-34); and

translating the determined at least one time into a wireless communication message and forwarding the message to the mobile device (see col. 4, line 38- col. 5, line 12 and col. 6, lines 28-51).

Although Rankin teaches the push of several event information to the mobile device, based on location, time information and user preference information (see col. 4, line 38- col. 5, line 12 and col. 6, lines 28-51), Rankin fails specifically to mention Azaan-neighborhood in association with “prayer times; time of year as measured from prestored annual calendar position corresponding to estimated location; and the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table”.

Hasebe, however, teaches a “prayer times; and the time of year as measured from prestored annual calendar position corresponding to estimated location; and the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table”.

(see below of col. 1, lines 37-63; col. 3, lines 28-50; col. 9, line 10- col. 10, line 37; and col. 11, lines 20-32).

[Relationships between regional locations and religious service times are described in the form of religious service time tables, which are stored in advance in the memory of the portable terminal or which can be downloaded from a specific server via networks. Religious service

times are determined based on the position information and date information (e.g., calendar data)...

In step S20, the portable telephone detects the date and year as well as the present position thereof. That is, the present position is detected based on the position information from the GPS receiver 12...

CPU 1 designates the religious service time table, which is stored in the RAM 3. Specifically, the religious service timetable contains numerous tables with regard to specific positions and dates, so that one of these tables is appropriately selected and read out in response to the position information from the GPS receiver 12 and the date information of the calendar data

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Regarding claim 23, as recited in claim 22, Rankin fails to teach Azaan-neighborhood.

Hasebe, however, teaches a portable terminal that includes GPS; and the portable terminal associates location and time with prayer times and direction (see col. 1, lines 37-63; col. 3, lines 28-50 and col. 4, lines 6-45).

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by

Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Regarding claim 24, as recited in claim 22, Rankin fails to teach Azaan-neighborhood.

Hasebe, however, teaches a portable terminal that includes GPS; and the portable terminal associates location and time with prayer times and direction (see col. 1, lines 37-63; col. 3, lines 28-50 and col. 4, lines 6-45).

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Regarding claim 25, Rankin discloses a system of notifying a mobile device (= mobile device 100) of location-dependent timings, (= location base information system that uses user location information and preference to push location information to the user, see col. 6, lines 28-65 and Fig. 4) the system comprising:

at least one base station (140) in communication with the mobile device;

a location server that determines an estimated location of the mobile device within a precision of a coverage area of that at least one base station by employing a location technology algorithm (= location determination is made from the network, see col. 4, lines 12-60; and col. 7, line 55- col. 8, line 54);

a server that runs a time calculation program application and compares the estimated location of the mobile device to a translation table stored at one or more memory locations including the mobile device and/or a remote server capable of forwarding information to the mobile device, said translation table to determine at least one time based on a function of at least the estimated location of the mobile device and the time of day as measured at the estimated location (see col. 3, lines 33-67, col. 4, line 12- col. 5, line 12, col. 5, lines 27-67; and col. 6, lines 28-51); and where the estimated location of the mobile station used to determine the at least one time has a precision of the coverage area of the at least one base station and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter (=using time different arrival of a mobile signal at base station to triangulate position of device 100, see col. 4, lines 12-34) assigned to the mobile device (see col. 3, lines 33-67, col. 4, line 12- col. 5, line 12, col. 5, lines 27-67; and col. 6, lines 28-51); wherein said Cell ID is a parameter in the translation table which identifies the Cell ID as an estimated location parameter of the mobile station based on the coverage area of the base station (=using time different arrival of a mobile signal at base station to triangulate position of device 100, see col. 4, lines 12-34); and a gateway that communicates with the server and which relays the at least one time to

the mobile device (see col. 4, line 1- col. 5, line 12; col. 6, lines 28-51; col. 7, line 55- col. 8, line 54 and Fig. 2).

Rankin fails specifically to mention a “prayer times; and the time of year as measured from prestored annual calendar position corresponding to estimated location; and the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table”.

Hasebe, however, teaches a “prayer times” and “the time of year as measured from prestored annual calendar position corresponding to estimated location and the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table”.

(see below of col. 1, lines 37-63; col. 3, lines 28-50; col. 9, line 10- col. 10, line 37; and col. 11, lines 20-32).

[Relationships between regional locations and religious service times are described in the form of religious service time tables, which are stored in advance in the memory of the portable terminal or which can be downloaded from a specific server via networks. Religious service times are determined based on the position information and date information (e.g., calendar data)...

In step S20, the portable telephone detects the date and year as well as the present position thereof. That is, the present position is detected based on the position information from the GPS receiver 12...

CPU 1 designates the religious service time table, which is stored in the RAM 3. Specifically, the religious service timetable contains numerous tables with regard to specific

positions and dates, so that one of these tables is appropriately selected and read out in response to the position information from the GPS receiver 12 and the date information of the calendar data...]

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Rankin and Hasebe are analogous art because they disclose concepts and practices regarding location-base services including GPS information in a communication system. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Hasebe into Rankin. The motivation for such combination would have been, as Hasebe suggests (see col. 3, lines 45-50), to effectively use the portable telephones by Muslims who pray, to display arrows showing the prescribed directions at the prescribed times.

Regarding claim 26, as recited in claim 25, Rankin further discloses the system, wherein the mobile device is one of: a mobile phone, location-aware wirelessly connected personal digital assistant (PDA), handheld personal computer, tablet personal computer, and a pocket personal computer (see col. 8, lines 35-62).

(10) Response to Argument

Regarding the alleged unpatentability over cited prior arts of Ranking et al., (U.S 6,879,838) in view of Hasebe et al., (U.S 6,946,991), the Examiner will detail the position in which the examination of the cited claims was made.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

a. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), with respect to **claims 12, 22 and 25**, the Appellants argue that neither Rankin nor Hasebe alone or in combination teaches or suggests the claimed limitations;

[“where the estimated location of the mobile device used to determine the at least one prayer time is based on the coverage area of the at least one base station and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter assigned to the mobile device” and “wherein said Cell ID is a parameter in the translation table which identifies the Cell ID as an estimated location parameter of the mobile station based on the coverage area of the base station, and where the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table”].

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant’s assertion based on the following reasons.

(1) The Examiner points out that cellular communication systems, for example as shown in Rankin, inherently includes cells and each cell is inherently controlled/identified by/with a single base station such as item 140 (see Rankin, col. 3, lines 61-67 and col. 5, lines 56-59) that transmits/broadcasts a specific cell/base ID. It is further inherent in cellular communication systems that mobile communication device(s) 100 must register with a particular base station when the mobile device powers-up in a particular cell. The registration process includes detection of a broadcasted cell/base identification that the cell site base station broadcasts to all mobile devices in that particular cell. This information is inherent and must be known to the mobile device as it registers with that base station.

Therefore, the cellular communication system, as taught by Rankin, must inherently include “Cell ID” as a parameter, for locating the “mobile station”, at the very least for incoming call completion.

(2) Rankin goes on to expand upon the inherent location system as described above and is understood to teach location determination of mobile device via GPS system and systems that receives signal from wireless beacons such as radio, acoustic or infrared, which emit an identifying location signal to mobile devices within range (see col. 8, lines 22-25; col. 8, line 66- col. 9, line 10). Rankin also mentions that many other implementations of location determination system 117, including time of arrival of a mobile signal at three or more base station sites (inherently identified by specific identification) to triangulate the position of the mobile device are possible depending on

the application (see col. 4, lines 27-34; and col. 4, lines 12-21). By using triangulation with respect to three or more base stations, the mobile device may be more precisely located within a specific area of a given cell as opposed to being located "somewhere" within the area covered by a particular cell/base ID.

Therefore, Rankin teaches the location determination of the radio mobile device inherently with respect to a cell ID for call completions and in a more precise manner, specific location determination within a cell with respect to triangulation using at least three cells.

(3) Hasebe is analogous art and further teaches a cellphone that includes determination of mobile position information of a mobile device via GPS and further teaches correspondence with a religious time table and notification (see, col. 4, lines 65-67 and col. 9, lines 20-37).

The examiner has concluded that given a cellular communication system must maintain the location of a mobile at least to a specific cell and that Rankin and Hasebe teaches further refinement and precise location of a mobile unit within the cellular system, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have utilized cell ID as a parameter in a location table that corresponds to religious time table and notification of prayers.

(4) Appellant specifically argues the criticality of using cell IDs as a parameter in the location table. However, appellant's claim 17 suggests other location technology algorithm methods, such as time distance of arrival or GPS as the location parameter.

Appellant's admission that the location calculation of the mobile station can be based on GPS and TDOA reinforces the teaching of Rankin and Hasebe in using a more precise location of the mobile as opposed to 'somewhere' within a cell as identified by the Cell identification received and stored at registration for call completion purposes.

Rankin's and Hasebe's usage of GPS and triangulation method to achieve location determination of the mobile device satisfies Appellant's claim 17.

Based on the above response/elaboration, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the argued claimed limitations in claims 12, 22 and 25.

b. **Regarding claim 13**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of "the estimated location of the mobile device has a precision of the coverage area of at least two adjacent base stations" since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitation of claim 12, as shown above, and further the claimed limitations of "the estimated locations of the mobile device has a precision of the coverage area of at

least two adjacent base stations (see Rankin, col. 3, lines 36-42 and lines 61-67 and col. 4, lines 30-34; where base stations are used to triangulate the position of a mobile device).

c. **Regarding claim 14**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “the precision of the coverage area of the at least one base station is used as an approximation of an Azaan-neighborhood in the translation table to determine the at least one prayer time” since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and further the claimed limitations of “the precision of the coverage area of the at least one base station is used as an approximation of an Azaan-neighborhood in the translation table to determine the at least one prayer time” (see Rankin, col. 4, lines 38-54, which describes provisioning of location based information to mobile device; and Hasebe teaches a cellphone that includes GPS and uses position information to provide religious time table and notification (see, col. 3, lines 37-55 and col. 9, lines 20-37)).

d. **Regarding claim 15**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “the at least one prayer time is a Muslim prayer time” since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner asserts that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and further the claimed limitations of “the at least one prayer time is a Muslim prayer time” (see Hasebe, col. 9, lines 27-37).

e. **Regarding claim 16**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “wherein the location technology algorithm calculates the location of the mobile device based on the Cell ID assigned to the mobile device” since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of “wherein the location technology algorithm calculates the location of the mobile device based on the Cell ID assigned to the mobile device (see Rankin, col. 9, lines 1-10).

f. **Regarding claim 17**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “wherein the location technology algorithm calculates the location of the mobile device based one or more of the following location technologies: global positioning system (GPS), assisted global positioning system (AGPS), advanced forward link trilateration (AFLT), enhanced observed time difference (EOTD), lime difference of arrival (TDOA), angle of arrival (AOA) and enhanced forward link trilateration (EFLT)” since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of “wherein the location technology algorithm calculates the location of the mobile device based one or more of the following location technologies: global positioning system (GPS), assisted global positioning system (AGPS), advanced forward link trilateration (AFLT), enhanced observed time difference (EOTD), time difference of arrival (TDOA), angle of arrival (AOA) and enhanced forward link trilateration (EFLT) (= GPS system can involved in location determination function, see col. 4, lines 11-37 of Rankin).

g. **Regarding claim 18**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “wherein the wireless communications operate over one or more of the following wireless communications protocols: advanced mobile phone service (AMPS), global system for mobile communication (GSM), time division multiple access (TDMA), frequency division multiple access (FDMA), code division multiple access (CDMA), general packet radio service (GPRS), universal mobile telecommunications system (UMTS) and integrated digital enhanced network (/DEN)” since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of “wherein the wireless communications operate over one or more of the following wireless communications protocols: advanced mobile phone service (AMPS), global system for

mobile communication (GSM), time division multiple access (TDMA), frequency division multiple access (FDMA), code division multiple access (CDMA), general packet radio service (GPRS), universal mobile telecommunications system (UMTS) and integrated digital enhanced network (/DEN') (= network 102 may be packet switch or circuit switch network, e.g. PSTN, see col. 6, lines 13-27 of Rankin).

h. **Regarding claim 19**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of "wherein the time is transmitted to the mobile device via a push protocol" since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of "wherein the time is transmitted to the mobile device via a push protocol (see col. col. 4, line 61- col. 5, line 15 of Rankin).

i. **Regarding claim 20**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of "monitoring subscriber information of a plurality of subscribers stored in a database and determining if each subscriber is currently connected to the subscriber network and updating the current Cell ID and location information of the subscriber and determining least one additional time based on the updated Cell ID and location information" since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of monitoring subscriber information of a plurality of subscribers stored in a database and determining if each subscriber is currently connected to the subscriber network and updating the current Cell ID and location information of the subscriber and determining at least one additional time based on the updated Cell ID and location information (see col. 4, lines 12-67 of Rankin).

j. **Regarding claim 21**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “wherein the wireless communication message is at least one of a text message, a tone indicator and a media file” since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of “wherein the wireless communication message is at least one of a text message, a tone indicator and a media file (see col. 4, lines 6-11 and col. 6, lines 28-51 of Rankin).

k. **Regarding claim 23**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “the Azaan-neighborhood coverage area is the same as a coverage area of one of a plurality of base stations in

communication range of the mobile device" since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of "Azaan-neighborhood coverage area is the same as a coverage area of one of a plurality of base stations in communication range of the mobile device (= Rankin teaches the provisioning of location information based the location of a mobile device via triangulation method, see col. 4, lines 30-54; and Hasebe teaches a cellphone that includes GPS and uses position information to provide religious time table and notification, see col. 3, lines 37-55 and col. 9, lines 20-37).

I. **Regarding claim 24**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of "the Azaan-neighborhood coverage area is the same as a coverage area of at least two of a plurality of base stations in communication range of the mobile device" since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of "the Azaan-neighborhood coverage area is the same as a coverage area of at least two of a plurality of base stations in communication range of the mobile device (= Rankin teaches the provisioning of location information based the location of a mobile device via triangulation method, see col. 4, lines 30-54; and Hasebe teaches a cellphone that

includes GPS and uses position information to provide religious time table and notification, see col. 3, lines 37-55 and col. 9, lines 20-37).

m. **Regarding claim 26**, the Appellant argues that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe does not disclose the claimed limitations of “wherein the mobile device is one of: a mobile phone, location-aware wirelessly connected personal digital assistant (PDA), handheld personal computer, tablet personal computer, and a pocket personal computer” since the combination of Rankin and Hasebe fails to disclose the argued claimed limitations in claim 12.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Rankin and Hasebe teaches the claimed limitations of claim 12, as shown above, and the claimed limitations of wherein the mobile device is one of: a mobile phone, location-aware wirelessly connected personal digital assistant (PDA), handheld personal computer, tablet personal computer, and a pocket personal computer, and a pocket personal computer (see Rankin, col. 8, lines 35-62).

Based on the above reasons, the Examiner believes that the rejections should be sustained.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Respectfully submitted,

/KWASI KARIKARI/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Conferees:

Charles Appiah

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Dwayne D. Bost/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617